UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,157	07/27/2007	Akihiko Kameyama	062989	7036
	7590 09/23/200 I, HATTORI, DANIEL	EXAMINER		
1250 CONNEC	TICUT AVENUE, NV	XU, XIAOYUN		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
KAMEYAMA ET AL.	
Art Unit	
1797	
	KAMEYAMA ET AL  Art Unit

	ROBERT XU	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wl with 37 CFR 41.31; or	nich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	٦.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	te extension fee action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	TE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present of the present of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims.</li> </ul>			e issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, 3		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	TOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	d.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	e because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Yelena G. Gakh/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Like mutual similarity index, correlation coefficient is a mathematical parameter used to describe the similarity between the fragments, with 1 for completely the same and 0 for completely different.

Therefore, the correlation coefficient of the MS2 (or MSn) fragments can be calculated before the precursor ion is fragmented and can be stored in a database.

Takegawa teaches that the MSs fragments that have lower correlation coefficient are easier to be differentiated by comparing their fragment ion intensities in the MS2 spectra (see page 387, right col. end of the 1st paragraph).

Takegawa further teaches that "while the average of the different isomers are 0.928(210.2 vs 210.3), 0.556 (210.2 vs 111.4), and 0.617 (210.3 vs 111.4). These differences are less definitive than those of 200.2, 200.3, and 101.4, mentioned above; in particular, the large value of 0.928 for the correlation between the 210.2 and 210.3 MS2 spectra is disappointing." (see page 388). Obviously, Takegawa made a point that selecting a precursor with high correlation coefficient of MS2 is not a good choice. Selecting a dominant ion as precursor is not necessarily a bad choice. But when the dominant ion has high correlation coefficient among its fragments, the selection becomes a bad choice.